

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 04706 01 OF 02 040248Z

72

ACTION EUR-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SS-15 NSC-10 PM-03 L-02 NEA-06 PRS-01

CIAE-00 INR-10 NSAE-00 RSC-01 MBFR-04 TRSE-00 SPC-03

DRC-01 /067 W

----- 008266

P R 032300Z OCT 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1928

INFO SECDEF WASHDC

ALL NATO CAPITALS 3326

USMISSION EC BRUSSELS

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 4706

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: NATO, PFOR

SUBJECT: ATLANTIC RELATIONS: OCTOBER 3 COUNCIL DISCUSSION

LIMDIS

SUMMARY: AT HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE OCTOBER 3 COUNCIL MEETING, FRANCE CIRCULATED A "DRAFT DECLARATION OF THE FIFTEEN ON ATLANTIC RELATIONS," WHICH ALLIES GREETED AS A POSITIVE AND VALUABLE CONTRIBUTION TO WORK WITHIN THE ALLIANCE ON A DECLARATION. NON-EC NATO COUNTRIES MADE STRONG PITCH FOR A MORE COMPREHENSIVE DECLARATION GOING BEYOND DEFENSE AND SECURITY ISSUES, PARTLY TO OFFSET WHAT CANADIAN PERMREP DESCRIBED AS A "U.S.-EUROPEAN AXIX". FRG, NETHERLANDS AND LUXEMBOURG FIRMLY SUPPORTED THIS NON-NINE VIEW, AND UK, ITALY AND DENMARK THOUGHT DECLARATION SHOULD HAVE A SOMEWHAT MORE COMPREHENSIVE CHARACTER THAN PRESCRIBED BY FRANCE. STATING THAT SECRETARY KISSINGER IS REPORTED WILLING TO ACCEPT A LIMITED NATO DOCUMENT, DUTCH REP BELIEVED THAT U.S. IS MISREADING BOTH ALLIED AND EC VIEWS ON SCOPE OF NATO ALLIANCE DECLARATION; ALLIES, A LARGE MAJORITY, INDEED EVEN A MAJORITY OF NINE FAVOR NATO DOCUMENT GOING WELL BEYOND DEFENSE AND SECURITY QUESTIONS. A MINIMUM, POSSIBLY OF ONE - DOES NOT. HE CALLED FOR LIFTING "VEIL OF SECRECY" FROM U.S.-EC DRAFTING ACTIVITY AND FOR

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 04706 01 OF 02 040248Z

AN END TO "RIVALRY" BETWEEN TWO DECLARATIONS.

LUNS NOTED COUNCIL VIEW THAT ALLIES SHOULD PROCEED URGENTLY

IN VIEW OF POSSIBLE VISIT BY PRESIDENT NIXON. HE SUGGESTED THAT NATO INTERNATIONAL STAFF PREPARE BY THE MIDDLE OF NEXT WEEK A DRAFT DECLARATION TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE VARIOUS NATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS. FRENCH PERMREP REJOINED THAT FRANCE WOULD PREFER AWAITING NATIONAL RESPONSES TO ITS DRAFT BEFORE LUNS UNDERTOOK THIS TASK, AND LUNS INDICATED THAT HE WOULD HOLD OFF FOR TIME BEING.

COUNCIL MEETING INCREASED PRESSURE ON U.S. TO MAKE ITS CONTRIBUTION, SINCE, WITH FRENCH DRAFT, ALL ALLIES HAVE NOW SUBMITTED THEIR RESPONSES TO THE U.S. "YEAR OF EUROPE" CHALLENGE. BELOW ARE ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO MAKING U.S. INPUT. END SUMMARY.

1. FRANCE. FRENCH REP (DE ROSE) SPOKE AT LENGTH AND CIRCULATED A DRAFT DECLARATION, WHICH HE CHARACTERIZED AS A DOCUMENT WHICH COULD HAVE THE SUPPORT OF ALL 15 ALLIES. IT FOCUSED ON DEFENSE AND SECURITY ISSUES, IN VIEW OF THE VITAL IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING LONG-TERM U.S. COMMITMENT TO DEFENSE OF WESTERN EUROPE. FRENCH DOCUMENT DID NOT CONTAIN SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO SUCH ISSUES AS MBFR AND BURDEN-SHARING, SINCE FRANCE BELIEVED THE DOCUMENT SHOULD HAVE LONG-TERM VALIDITY AND NOT BE PREOCCUPIED WITH TEMPORARY CIRCUMSTANCES. (SEE SEPTELS FOR TEXT OF FRENCH DECLARATION AND FULL SUMMARY OF DE ROSE'S STATEMENT.)

2. PORTUGAL. NOGUEIRA ALSO MADE EXTENDED REMARKS, NOTING THAT, WHILE CONDITIONS HAD CHANGED IN EUROPE AND EUROPE WAS NO LONGER FRIGHTENED OF SOVIET AGGRESSION TO THE SAME DEGREE AS IN 1945-46, THE COMMUNIST MENACE WILL THREATEN THE ALLIES FOR THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE. THE COMMON BONDS OF CHRISTIANITY, AND GRECO-ROMAN CIVILIZATION WOULD CONTINUE TO BE THREATENED BY MESSIANIC COMMUNISM. IN CONTRAST TO THE AGGRESSIVE STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF LENINISM, THE NATO TREATY IS A PURELY DEFENSIVE DOCUMENT. NOGUEIRA DID NOT QUESTION THE MERITS OF THE CANADIAN TEXT (ALTHOUGH HIS COMMENTS WERE OBVIOUSLY DIRECTED AGAINST ITS ORIENTATION TOWARDS DETENTE) BUT CONSIDERED THAT THE FRENCH DRAFT DESERVED THE CLOSEST ATTENTION.

SECRET  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 04706 01 OF 02 040248Z

3. NORWAY. BUSCH SAID THAT IN ADDITION TO DEFENSE AND SECURITY ISSUES, ALLIANCE DECLARATION WOULD NEED TO DEAL WITH "POLITICAL" QUESTIONS SUCH AS ECONOMIC AND MONETARY PROBLEMS, ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES, AND RELATIONS WITH DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. ALLIANCE SHOULD NOT DEAL IN DETAIL WITH SOME OF THESE ISSUES BUT SHOULD EXPRESS NEED FOR A SOLUTION TO THESE PROBLEMS AND THE ALLIES DETERMINATION TO STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN THESE FIELDS IN APPROPRIATE BODIES. THE ROLE OF NATO IN THE POLITICAL SPHERE SHOULD BE CLEARLY STATED, AND THE ALLIES SHOULD AGREE TO DEVELOP FURTHER THE POLITICAL DIALOGUE WHICH HAD EVOLVED SO FRUITFULLY IN RECENT YEARS.

4. OSLO WAS ENCOURAGED BY PROGRESS ON EC-U.S. DOCUMENT BUT WANTED TO ENSURE "PARALLELISM" IN THE PREPARATION OF BOTH DECLARATIONS. THE TWO DOCUMENTS ARE DIFFERENT IN CHARACTER, BUT SHOULD AIM AT AVOIDING ANY INCONSISTENCY, WHICH COULD CREATE THE IMPRESSION OF DISUNITY. THE TWO TEXTS WILL NEED TO OVERLAP CONSIDERABLY TO AVOID THIS PROBLEM. BUSCH HOPED THAT IN FURTHER WORK ON A U.S. -EC TEXT THE INTERESTS OF ALL THE ALLIES WOULD BE KEPT IN MIND.

5. U.S. RUMSFELD SAID THAT THE U.S. ATTACHES GREAT IMPORTANCE TO THE ENDEAVOR OF DEVELOPING A NATO DECLARATION IN THE COUNCIL. THE U.S. WELCOMES THE INCREASING NUMBER OF CONTRIBUTIONS BY ITS ALLIES AND VIEWS THE NEW FRENCH DRAFT AS AN IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTION TO ALLIANCE-WIDE CONSIDERATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF A DECLARATION. RUMSFELD STRESSED THAT THE U.S. GOVERNMENT WILL GIVE THE FRENCH DRAFT SERIOUS STUDY. FINALLY, HE SAID THAT THE U.S. IS GIVING URGENT CONSIDERATION TO ITS INPUT AND HE ANTICIPATED THAT HE WILL HAVE INSTRUCTIONS IN THE NEAR FUTURE.

6. CANADA. MENZIES REPORTED THAT OTTAWA HAD REACTED OFFICIALLY TO THE DRAFT DECLARATION WHICH HE RECENTLY CIRCULATED ON HIS OWN AUTHORITY, AND WISHES TO MAKE A FEW AMENDMENTS (SEE SEPTEL FOR TEXT OF CANADIAN AMENDMENTS). HE FOUND VALUABLE EMPHASIS IN FRENCH DRAFT ON DEFENSE AND SECURITY ISSUES, POSSIBILITY THAT THIS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 04706 02 OF 02 040139Z

72  
ACTION EUR-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SS-15 NSC-10 PM-03 L-02 NEA-06 PRS-01

CIAE-00 INR-10 NSAE-00 RSC-01 MBFR-04 TRSE-00 SPC-03

DRC-01 /067 W  
----- 007773

P R 032300Z OCT 73  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1929  
INFO SECDEF WASHDC  
ALL NATO CAPITALS 3327  
USMISSION EC BRUSSELS

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 4706

DOCUMENT COULD BE AGREED BY ALL FIFTEEN AND FACT THAT IT STRESSED LONG TERM GOALS. HE ARGUED STRONGLY, HOWEVER, THAT ALLIANCE SHOULD BE USED INCREASINGLY AS A FORUM FOR CONSIDER-

ING A WIDE RANGE OF ISSUES. HE NOTED COUNCIL'S EFFECTIVE ROLE AS COORDINATOR FOR CERTAIN MAJOR EAST-WEST NEGOTIATIONS AND THE CONTINUING VALIDITY OF ARTICLE II OF NATO TREATY. WHILE CANADA WELCOMED PROGRESS TOWARDS A WEST EUROPEAN COMMUNITY, IT HAD ALWAYS ASSUMED THAT THIS COMMUNITY WOULD BE WITHIN THE WIDER ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE. ALLUDING TO APPARENT U.S.-EC "AXIS," MENZIES SAID THAT CANADA WAS KEENLY INTERESTED IN CONTENT OF DOCUMENT WHICH U.S. AND EC WERE WORKING OUT. PASSAGES WHICH OTTAWA HAD NOTED IN THE "PUBLISHED" EC DECLARATION HAD A DIRECT BEARING ON CANADIAN NATIONAL INTERESTS. CANADA COULD OF COURSE MAKE ITS VIEWS KNOWN BI-LATERALLY, BUT ALSO WANTED THEM EXPRESSED WITHIN THE ALLIANCE DECLARATION. IF IT BECAME IMPOSSIBLE TO PUT ALL ELEMENTS INTO ONE DOCUMENT, CANADA COULD ENVISAGE SPLITTING UP SOME OF THE ISSUES, E.G. SOME COULD BE COVERED IN DECLARATION, OTHERS IN A COMMUNIQUE.

7. DENMARK. SVART BELIEVED THAT DECLARATION SHOULD BE DESIGNED TO HAVE MOST FAVORABLE EFFECT POSSIBLE ON PUBLIC OPINION. IT SHOULD EMPHASIZE THE FREE AND COOPERATIVE CHARACTER OF THE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 04706 02 OF 02 040139Z

ALLIANCE, ITS PURSUIT OF WORLD PEACE AND THAT FACT THAT IT OPERATED TO THE DETRIMENT OF NO COUNTRY. DECLARATION SHOULD FOCUS ON DEFENSE AND DETENTE (INCLUDING DISARMAMENT) AND ON IMPORTANCE OF ALLIANCE CONSULTATION, BUT SHOULD NOT GO TOO FAR INTO SUBJECTS WITH WHICH THE ALLIANCE HAS NOT DEALT.

8. ITALY. CATALANO REMARKED THAT, IN VIEW OF FRENCH DRAFT, ITALY WOULD MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO ACHIEVE A DOCUMENT ACCEPTABLE TO ALL FIFTEEN. HE ALSO AGREED WITH NORWEGIAN CONCEPT OF PARALLELISM AND THOUGHT THERE WOULD NEED TO BE SOME OVERLAPPING BETWEEN THE TWO DECLARATIONS.

9. UK. PECK NOTED THAT FRENCH DRAFT CONTAINED MANY USEFUL STATEMENTS ABOUT ALLIANCE DEFENSES, AND HE AGREED WITH DENMARK THAT DECLARATION SHOULD NOT DEAL WITH SUBJECTS WHICH ARE NOT DISCUSSED IN NATO. NOTING RUMSFELD'S REMARK, PECK HOPED THAT ALL NATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS WOULD BE ON THE TABLE IN VERY NEAR FUTURE.

10. TURKEY. ERALP FAVORED STRENGTHENING CANADIAN TEXT WITH ELEMENTS FROM FRENCH AND TURKISH DRAFTS. WHILE HE AGREED WITH IMPORTANCE OF APPEAL TO PUBLIC OPINION, HE ALSO THOUGHT THAT PUBLIC OPINION SHOULD BE AWARE OF CURRENT REALITIES SUCH AS THE INCREASING STRENGTH OF THE WARSAW PACT. HE SHARED CANADIAN VIEWS ON NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE DECLARATION AND WOULD ALSO FAVOR A CONNECTING CHAPEAU BETWEEN BOTH DECLARATIONS. IN VIEW OF ARTICLE II OF NATO TREATY, FAILURE TO MENTION ECONOMIC PROBLEMS IN ALLIANCE DECLARATION WOULD BE A SERIOUS SHORTCOMING.

11. NETHERLANDS. BUWALDA RECALLED EARLIER DUTCH STATEMENTS IN FAVOR OF A COMPREHENSIVE ALLIANCE DECLARATION, DESIGNED TO APPEAL TO PUBLIC OPINION, COVERING ECONOMIC AND MONETARY FIELDS AND MENTIONING DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND RELATIONS WITH THE THIRD WORLD. BUWALDA THEN ADDED "PERSONAL" OBSERVATION, BASED ON "WORKING LEVEL" VIEWS IN THE HAGUE. HE REPORTED THAT SECRETARY KISSINGER HAD MADE IT KNOWN DURING RECENT DISCUSSIONS WITH EC COUNTRIES THAT U.S. COULD ACCEPT A NATO DECLARATION RESTRICTED TO DEFENSE AND SECURITY ISSUES. IF THIS IS SO, THERE MUST BE A MISUNDERSTANDING ON THE PART OF THE U.S. OF THE EC POSITION. THE EUROPEAN ALLIES FAVOR A MORE COMPREHENSIVE ALLIANCE DECLARATION. FRANCE ALONE PREFERENCES MORE RESTRICTIVE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 04706 02 OF 02 040139Z

APPROACH, BUT EVEN FRANCE HAS EXPRESSED UNDERSTANDING FOR THE POSITION OF THE NON-EC NATO MEMBERS. THERE SHOULD NOT BE SUCH A COMPETITION BETWEEN THE NATO AND U.S.-EC DECLARATIONS. OTHER ALLIES SHOULD BE PROMPTLY INFORMED OF WORK GOING ON IN THE U.S.-EC CONTEXT TO INSURE THAT THE WORK DOES NOT PROCEED AT CROSS PURPOSES. "VEIL OF SECRECY" OVER U.S.-EC DIALOGUE SHOULD BE LIFTED. AS FOR DEALING WITH VARIETY OF ISSUES WHICH CERTAIN ALLIES HAVE SUGGESTED THUS FAR FOR AN ALLIANCE DECLARATION, ALLIANCE SHOULD TAKE EACH QUESTION SEPARATELY AND, FOLLOWING THIS INDUCTIVE APPROACH, SEE HOW MUCH AGREEMENT CAN BE REACHED.

12. BELGIUM. BELGIAN REP BAL NOTED IMPORTANT NEW ELEMENTS IN FRENCH DRAFT AND HOPED ALLIES WOULD MOVE PROMPTLY TOWARDS DRAFTING A SINGLE DECLARATION.

13. FRG. FRG BELIEVED DECLARATION SHOULD FOCUS ON SECURITY, BUT NOT EXCLUSIVELY SINCE ARTICLE II WOULD ALSO INCLUDE ECONOMIC AND MONETARY ASPECTS. CANADIAN DRAFT PROVIDES A PRACTICAL CHECKLIST. BOSS WELCOMED RUMSFELD'S STATEMENT AND SAID HE WAS PLEASED US WOULD TABLE A "TEXT". (COMMENT: BOSS WAS BASING HIS STATEMENT THAT U.S. WOULD TABLE A "TEXT" ON OTHER SOURCES. IN MISSION STATEMENTS IN THE NAC AND IN CORRIDOR WORK, INCLUDING AMBASSADOR RUMSFELD'S REMARKS ON OCT 3 USNATO HAS NOT REPEAT NOT GONE BEYOND INDICATING THAT U.S. WAS GIVING CONSIDERATION TO ITS "INPUT" END COMMENT)

14. LUXEMBOURG. AGREED WITH DUTCH APPROACH FAVORING A COMPREHENSIVE DRAFT.

15. GREECE. ALSO FAVORED A COMPREHENSIVE TEXT, WHICH SHOULD INCLUDE BURDENSHARING AS AN IMPORTANT ELEMENT.

16. LUNS. SYG NOTED VIEW OF COUNCIL THAT, GIVEN RECENT NEWS (APPARENTLY REPORT OF TRADER VIC INTERVIEW) OF PRESIDENT'S APPARENT INTENTION TO VISIT EUROPE WITHIN THE NEXT FEW MONTHS, WORK ON A DECLARATION SHOULD PROCEED URGENTLY. HE ALSO NOTED VIEW OF NON-EC ALLIES, SUPPORTED PARTICULARLY BY NETHERLANDS, FRG

AND LUXEMBOURG THAT ALLIANCE DECLARATION SHOULD BE COMPREHENSIVE IN SCOPE. LUNS SAID THAT, IF COUNCIL AGREED, HE AND HIS STAFF WOULD BEGIN DRAFTING A DECLARATION, ON THE BASIS OF NATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS THUS FAR, AND WOULD HOPE TO TABLE SOMETHING BY

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 04706 02 OF 02 040139Z

OCTOBER 20 NAC MEETING. DE ROSE RESPONDED THAT HE PREFERRED TO HAVE INSTRUCTED REACTIONS FROM ALLIED CAPITALS TO FRENCH DRAFT BEFORE MOVING AHEAD TO AN INTEGRATED DRAFT, AND LUNS INDICATED THAT HE WOULD HOLD OFF.

17. IN OUR VIEW, THERE ARE THREE ALTERNATIVE WAYS IN WHICH THE U.S MIGHT MAKE ITS INPUT: 1) AS A NEW DRAFT; 2) AS GENERAL OR SPECIFIC COMMENTS WHICH WE WOULD LEAVE TO SYG TO INCORPORATE INTO HIS DRAFT; OR 3) AS GENERAL COMMENTS, PRESENTED IN THE NAC PLUS A NEW DRAFT WHICH WE WOULD GIVE TO LUNS PRIVATELY. OPTION (3) WILL VERY LIKELY NOT BE AVAILABLE AFTER MID NEXT WEEK.

RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptoning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 02 APR 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 03 OCT 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** boyleja  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973NATO04706  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19731064/abqcecmp.tel  
**Line Count:** 294  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** LIMITED OFFICIAL USE  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** LIMDIS  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 6  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** LIMITED OFFICIAL USE  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** LIMDIS  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** boyleja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 14 AUG 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <14-Aug-2001 by elyme>; APPROVED <25-Sep-2001 by boyleja>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** ATLANTIC RELATIONS: OCTOBER 3 COUNCIL DISCUSSION  
**TAGS:** NATO, PFOR  
**To:** STATE INFO SECDEF  
ALL NATO CAPITALS  
EC BRUSSELS  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005